

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17 are pending and were rejected. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein. Claims 16 and 18 were canceled previously. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 13-15 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-15 and 17 are rejected under §35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett et al. (U.S. 5,870,080).

CLAIM 13

Claim 13 is independent and is directed towards:

An user interface for transferring data between a host computer and another device via an infrared link, comprising:

an infrared bridge integrated into a pointing device, said infrared bridge being communicatable with said host computer and said device;

a graphical user interface running on said host computer wherein said graphical user interface executes at least one function of a plurality of possible functions relating to data that is transferred between said device and said host computer via said infrared bridge.

The office action states that Burnett does not disclose a graphical user interface. However, the office action states that graphical user interfaces are inherent to computers and that all peripheral devices can be equipped with IR bridge communications. The office action concludes that it would have been obvious to incorporate a graphical user interface on a host computer and that the graphical user interface executes at least one function of a plurality of possible functions relating to data that is transferred and a position of a cursor controlled by the pointing device.

The applicant agrees with the office action in that graphical user interfaces are used in some computers and that Burnett does not disclose a graphical user interface.

With regards to other elements of claim 13, the office action makes some assumptions in showing obviousness that the applicant contends stretch the disclosure of Burnett far beyond its bounds. For example, the office action states that it would be obvious for the graphical user interface to execute at least one of a function of a plurality functions relating to data that is transferred between the device and the host computer via the infrared bridge. Without a graphical user interface disclosed, Burnett cannot even suggest the graphical user interface executing any function, including the functions of claim 13. Thus, this element of claim 13 cannot be obvious.

The applicant respectfully requests a publication disclosing the above-discussed element of claim 13 if this rejection is maintained.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 13 has been overcome and the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 14, 15, AND 17

Claims 14, 15, and 17 are dependent on claim 13 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-12 are rejected under §35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett et al. (U.S. 5,870,080) as applied to claims 1-6, 13-15, and 17 above, and further in view of Mantha (6,137,487).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is independent and is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A computer operable method, comprising:
initiating communication between an IR equipped device and a computer pointing device with an IR bridge, wherein data is transferable between said computer pointing device and a computer;
determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface associated with a computer a cursor is positioned over; and,
processing said data according to what said graphical object represents.

The applicant disagrees with the office action for the reasons set forth below. The rejection states that Burnett discloses "determining what position and command state of the pointing device and processing data according to what command or file pointing device is positioned over and processing data communicated (Col. 6, Lines 34-39) via the IR bridge (140 of Fig. 1, Col. 4, Lines 40, 41) according to what said graphical object represents." The applicant respectfully notes that the aforementioned items are not claimed in claim 1. Rather, claim 1 includes "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface associated with a computer a cursor is positioned over."

The office action does state that Burnett does not disclose "processing data according to what graphical object represents." The applicant notes that, according to the previous section of the office action, Burnett does not disclose a graphical user interface, to which the applicant agrees. Thus, Burnett cannot disclose "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface associated with a computer a cursor is positioned over" as claimed in claim 1.

According to the office action, Mantha discloses "processing data according to what graphical object represents" at column 6, lines 12-19. This section of Mantha simply discloses receiving signals from a keyboard or a mouse. There is nothing related to "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface associated with a computer a cursor is positioned over" and "processing said data according to what said graphical object represents" as claimed in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the references taken individually or in combination do not disclose all the elements of claim 1 and cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Furthermore, there is no motivation for the combination suggested. Burnett is related to a computer that receives data via a pointing device and Mantha is related to a remote control for a television. The office action fails to show any motivation for this combination. In addition, neither references suggests such a combination.

Therefore, the applicant contends that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and requests reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 2-6

Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 7

Claim 1 is independent and is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for transferring data from an IR equipped device to said computer via a computer pointing device with an integrated IR bridge, said method steps comprising:

initiating communication between said IR equipped device and said computer by way of said computer pointing device using said integrated IR bridge;

determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor associated with said computer is positioned over; and,

processing data sent via said integrated IR bridge according to what said graphical object represents.

According to the office action, Burnett discloses "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor is positioned over" at column 6, lines 25-35; column 4, line 26 to column 5, line 5. However, as stated in the section of the office action related to claim 13, Burnett does not disclose a graphical user interface. Therefore, Burnett cannot disclose "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor is positioned over" as claimed in claim 7.

According to the office action, Mantha discloses "processing data according to what graphical object represents" at column 6, lines 12-19. This section of Mantha simply discloses receiving signals from a keyboard or a mouse. There is nothing related to "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface associated with a computer a cursor is positioned over" and "processing said data according to what said graphical object represents" as claimed in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the references taken individually or in combination do not disclose all the elements of claim 1 and cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Furthermore, there is no motivation for the combination suggested. Burnett is related to a computer that receives data via a pointing device and Mantha is related to a remote control for a television. The office action fails to show any motivation for this combination. In addition, neither references suggests such a combination.

Therefore, the applicant contends that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and requests reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 8-12

Claims 8-12 are dependent on claim 7 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

Dated: March 9, 2006

By:



Robert W. Nelson
Reg. No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266